

**DDS**

Period	Grades	Difference In Base Rate	Average Increase Upon Promotion	Step Increase In Former Grade	Average Time In Grade	Average Increase If Promoted Two Grade Steps
May 1959 to May 1960	GS-7 to GS-8	\$ 490	\$310	\$150	20.2	\$825
	GS-9 to GS-10	520	276	150	25.0	801
May 1958 to May 1959	GS-7 to GS-9	1,005	769	150	19.0	---
	GS-9 to GS-11	1,045	767	150	23.0	---

***SAMPLE JOB TITLES:**

Investigator
Personnel Security Officer
Physical Security Officer
Security Officer
Budget Officer
Visual Information Specialist
Psychologist (Assessment)
Business Accountant
Adm Officer
Illustrator
Adm Assistant
Fiscal Accounts Assistant

JOB NO. _____ BOX NO. _____ FILED NO. _____ BOX NO. _____ NO OF
IN CLASS / RECLASS / UNCLAS CHAN _____
NEXT REV DATE _____
NO. PAGES _____
REV CLASS _____

CONFIDENTIAL

2-~~SECRET~~ CHA

***SAMPLE JOB**

Investigator
Personnel
Physical
Security
Budget Officer
Visual Information
Psychology
Business
Admin Office
Illustrations
Admin Assistant
Fiscal Accounting

Approved For Release

Approved For Release 2002/02/11 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

OCR
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMPENSATION RECEIVED UPON PROMOTION*

Period	Grades	Difference In Base Rate	Average Increase Upon Promotion	Step Increase In Former Grade	Average Time In Grade	Average Increase If Promoted Two Grades
May 1959 to May 1960	GS-7 to GS-8	\$ 490	\$340	\$150	13.4	\$780
	GS-9 to GS-10	520	270	150	28.2	770
May 1958 to May 1959	GS-7 to GS-9	1,005	812	150	13.1	---
	GS-9 to GS-11	1,045	830	150	22.6	---

*SAMPLE JOB TITLES:
Librarian
Biographic Analyst
Industrial Analyst
Graphic Analyst
Intelligence Analyst

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2002/02/11 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

Approved For Release 2002/02/14 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

AGENCY
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMPENSATION RECEIVED UPON PROMOTION

Period	Grades	Difference in Base Rate	Average Increase Upon Promotion	Step Increase In Former Grade	Average Time in Grade	Average Increase If Promoted Two Grades
May 1959 to May 1960	GS-7 to GS-8	\$ 490	\$304	\$150	20.7	\$800
	GS-9 to GS-10	520	278	150	24.2	777
May 1958 to May 1959	GS-7 to GS-9	1,005	765	150	19.2	--
	GS-9 to GS-11	1,045	776	150	24.1	--

Approved For Release 2002/02/14 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

S E C R E T
Approved For Release 2002/02/11 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

CSCS
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMPENSATION RECEIVED UPON PROMOTION*

Period	Grades	Difference In Base Rate	Average Increase Upon Promotion	Step Increase In Former Grade	Average Time In Grade	Average Increase If Promoted Two Grades
May 1959 to May 1960	GS-7-8	\$ 490	\$279	\$150	24.4	\$725
	GS-9-10	520	272	150	27.2	667
May 1958 to May 1959	GS-7-9	1,005	738	150	26.9	---
	GS-9-11	1,045	735	150	29.6	---

*SAMPLE JOB TITLES:
Operations Officer
Reports Officer
Intelligence Analyst

S E C R E T

Approved For Release 2002/02/11 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

Approved For Release 2002/02/11 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

S E C R E T

DDI
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMPENSATION RECEIVED UPON PROMOTION*

Period	Grades	Difference In Base Rate	Average Increase Upon Promotion	Step Increase In Former Grade	Average Time In Grade	Average Increase If Promoted Two Grades
May 1959 to May 1960	GS-7 to GS-8	\$ 490	\$322	\$150	17.4	\$833
	GS-9 to GS-10	520	301	150	21.0	826
May 1958 to May 1959	GS-7 to GS-9	1,005	780	150	13.1	---
	GS-9 to GS-11	1,045	836	150	19.8	---

SAMPLE JOB TITLES:
Intelligence Officer
Photo Intelligence Officer
IO Material Economist
Intelligence Analyst
Info Specialist
Geographer
IO (Cartographer)
Biographic Analyst
Document Analyst

Approved For Release 2002/02/11 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

ILLEGIB

Approved For Release 2002/02/11 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

Approved For Release 2002/02/11 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

C O N F I D E N T I A L

Approved For Release 2002/02/11 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

ARGUMENTS

2. IT WILL BE DIFFICULT TO MAKE MEANINGFUL DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THE PERFORMANCE OF INDIVIDUALS COMPETING FOR ADVANCEMENT INTO GRADES GS-6, GS-8, AND GS-10.

3. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PROMOTIONS AS OPPOSED TO STEP INCREASES WILL BE LOST UNDER THE SINGLE GRADE POLICY.

4. THE MORALE OF EMPLOYEES IN GRADES GS-6, GS-8 AND GS-10 WILL BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED BECAUSE OF THEIR "ODD BALL" GRADES WHEN THEIR JOBS ARE RATED AT A GRADE HIGHER.

5. SINCE OTHER AGENCIES DO NOT USE GRADES GS-6, GS-8 AND GS-10 IN PROFESSIONAL LINES OF WORK, CIA WILL BE AT A PSYCHOLOGICAL DISADVANTAGE IN RECRUITMENT.

6. THE USE OF MORE GRADES WITH LESS SIGNIFICANT CLASSIFICATION AND DOLLAR SPREAD IS CONTRARY TO CURRENT OBJECTIVES ON REVISED COMPENSATION PLANS, NAMELY: FEWER GRADES--GREATER PAY RANGE.

ALTERNATE COURSE OF ACTION

1. RETURN TO FORMER TWO-GRADE PROMOTION POLICY.
2. CONTINUE PRESENT POLICY OF SINGLE GRADE PROMOTION.
3. PERMIT CAREER SERVICES TO ESTABLISH THEIR OWN POLICY AS TO SINGLE OR DOUBLE GRADE PROMOTIONS.
4. ESTABLISH ONE GRADE PROGRESSION TO GS-9, FOLLOWED BY PROMOTION TO GS-11 AND SINGLE GRADE THEREAFTER.

COMMENTS

2. WITH INDIVIDUALS DISTRIBUTED AMONG MORE GRADES, THE SIZE OF THE GROUPS COMPETING WILL BE SMALLER AND PROBABLY SIMPLIFY COMPETITIVE CONSIDERATIONS.

3. THE ATTACHMENT "COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COMPENSATION RECEIVED UPON PROMOTION" POINTS OUT THAT SALARY INCREASES RECEIVED UNDER THE SINGLE GRADE POLICY HAVE AVERAGED TO BE ONLY EQUIVALENT OF TWO STEP INCREASES. ARGUMENT IS CONSIDERED VALID.

4. SOME INDICATIONS HAVE BEEN BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION OF EMPLOYEE DISSATISFACTION WITH THE POLICY. THIS MAY STEM FROM THE DEMONSTRATED FACT THAT TIME IN GRADE FOR THE ONE GRADE PROMOTION HAS NOT BEEN CHANGED IN PRACTICE FROM PREVIOUS TIME IN GRADE FOR A TWO GRADE ADVANCE.

5. POSSIBLY VALID. HOWEVER, SUCH INTERAGENCY COMPARISONS ARE SELDOM MEANINGFUL IN THE DD, AREA. AGAIN THE RATE OF ADVANCE IS CONSIDERED MORE MEANINGFUL THAN THE NUMBER OF GRADES USED FROM THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STANDPOINT.

6. TRUE. HOWEVER, SUCH SYSTEMS PROVIDE MERIT INCREASE WITHIN THE GRADES WHICH CAN BE ACCOMMODATED ALTERNATELY BY MORE SINGLE GRADE PROMOTIONS.

1. CLANDESTINE SERVICES ARE ON RECORD AS FAVORING CONTINUANCE OF THE CURRENT ONE-GRADE PROMOTION POLICY. DD/I FAVORS RETURN TO TWO-GRADE POLICY. IF THE LATTER COURSE OF ACTION IS AGREED UPON, PERSONNEL PROMOTED UNDER THE ONE GRADE POLICY WILL HAVE TO BE RECONSIDERED FOR REPROMOTION BY AN ADDITIONAL GRADE OR INEQUITIES WILL RESULT IN THE RELATIVE STANDING OF THE PERSONNEL IN A CAREER SERVICE. THIS COURSE OF ACTION WOULD RETURN THE AGENCY TO GENERAL GOVERNMENT POLICY AND WOULD AVOID CHARGES OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST YOUNGER AND LOWER PAID PERSONNEL.

2. ALTHOUGH DESIRED BY THE CLANDESTINE SERVICES, THE WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE APPEARS TO INDICATE THAT THE POLICY HAS NOT PROVED TO BE AS SUCCESSFUL ELSEWHERE IN THE AGENCY.

3. HAS THE DISADVANTAGE OF DISSIMILAR TREATMENT OF ADVANCEMENT IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE AGENCY AND COULD BE A CAUSE FOR CONTINUED MORALE PROBLEMS. THIS WOULD NOT NECESSARILY BE SO, HOWEVER, IF THE RATE OF ADVANCEMENT WAS CAREFULLY ESTABLISHED TO PROVIDE ESSENTIAL UNIFORMITY.

4. THIS ALTERNATE WOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH CSCS PANEL STRUCTURE (ONE GRADE PROMOTION IN PANEL D). IT WOULD RETAIN THE ADVANTAGES OF SINGLE GRADE PROMOTIONS IN LOWER RANGES FOUND TO EXIST IN THE JOTP AND IN OFFICES SUCH AS OCR. IT WOULD CONTINUE FLEXIBILITY IN IN-HIRING OF YOUNGER PERSONNEL THROUGH THE USE OF MORE GRADES TO EXPRESS LEVEL OF QUALIFICATIONS.

Approved For Release 2002/02/11 : CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4

C O N F I D E N T I A L

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, gentlemen, shall we proceed from this highly complex subject? For Release 2002/02/11: CIA-RDP78-03578A000500030001-4
(Laughter) SECRET

25X1A The Personnel Office has prepared a brief summary of what has happened in the last year or year and a half, which has been placed in front of you on that dittoed sheet called CIA Promotion Policy. Then in your material sent to you by [REDACTED] you have the Communications Office promotion policy and the Clandestine Services Instruction [REDACTED] on Promotions to Grade GS-15, and you have the draft of the Promotion Policy of the Office of Operations. 25X1A So my only question is, which one do you want to talk from? I think the best thing to do is to establish exactly what criteria we want to set.

25X1A [REDACTED] Are our deliberations in any way affected by what I understand is rapidly becoming the policy of the so-called Super Grade Board?

MR. WHITE: I was going to say, in view of the ramifications of competitive promotion that came out and were not solved in any way at all as affects super-grades alone, insofar as the competitive aspects of this thing and how it is going to work are concerned, I think we might do well to wait until we see whether or not the heads of all the major components can serve the super-grade components.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Red, I was just thinking with admiration of how

SECRET

that line of L. K. White's was receding very slowly.

The Super-grade Board in the previous discussion was agreed on. It is already established.

MR. WHITE: I think the one concrete thing which this Board can do, and frankly, I'm not sure that we can do much more at this time, is to come out with some Agency policy on time-in-grade to establish eligibility, which is only one small part of promotion policy.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Up to GS-15. Why don't we take, then, as a starting point, page 4 of the Office of Communications' paper.

[REDACTED] You are a stern man, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Why?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The funny part about it is to compare that with what OO wants to do, and I think OO has always been on the liberal side in his promotion policy, if you agree with that, Red and Harry? And the fact is that Commo starts out fairly stringent in the lower grades and OO gets stricter as it gets higher.

[REDACTED] That follows Civil Service very closely, doesn't it?

[REDACTED] You will notice that reviewing element in the sentence just before that. This is only at the time they are brought up for review.

[REDACTED] That is the critical point in time-in-grade, as I see it. It only means you won't be considered seriously before that time has elapsed.

[REDACTED] An item that came to my attention today, under this schedule, there are ten GS-12's all eligible for consideration to four slots. So I am going to be forced to adopt the "best qualified" system and select those people up, otherwise it's just not going to work. They are all in about the same category in order of merit.

[REDACTED] And any of these ten are technically qualified to fill the four slots?

[REDACTED] What are you going to do? I think we are going to have to consider a selection based on the best qualified.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, you are in competitive promotions whether you want it or not.

[REDACTED] Within my Office.

Incidentally, this is not a promotion policy, this is a procedure

SECRET

for the Career Service Board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any comment on these requirements?

MR. WHITE: It takes a man 14 years to get to be a Grade 15.

How much longer does he have in a career?

They would all be chiefs and there would be no Indians.

MR. AMORY: But conversely, if you have a thing like this, say 24 months from a grade 12 to 13 - you go out and hire a guy 36 or 40 years old and you don't really know how good he is. You think he is going to be well worthwhile, but it's a one-out-of-three shot that he is damn well going to be a Division chief but quick.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It would be more like one out of 100.

Paragraph "c" applies in those cases, Mr. Amory.

MR. AMORY: I realize you have the exception, but I think the idea, say in 15 years a fellow can get up to 15, that is, assuming he goes to work for you at 22 or 23, then this is a darn good course. But if you have taken the guy out of the Army, out of business, out of the academic life, or something like that, I just don't think we want to impose on ourselves any more rigidity than is necessary. In business you advance people according to their ability and energy, and this, that and the other thing. And I think the more we can preserve that flexibility which, thank God we have in this Agency more than in the Post Office and other places -

But you have to have some policy or you get off on inequities

But this is sheer chaos. I believe that you can have a system that is flexible and simple and will work.

This was written for an office in which almost 95 or 90 per cent come in below a 7. It's an exception to take anybody in at a 9. I think we took one in at a 12. This was written for a different kind of an office than some of the others.

MR. AMORY: You hire a Ph.D., say 27 or 28, probably at a GS-12. Now he may remain a 12 for 20 years if all he can do is be a good scholar. But if he shows executive ability, imagination and that kind of thing, like somebody like that, then you would want to make him a 15 quick, just to get him over other individuals. You can't put a guy in command if he is actually

SECRET

junior in grade.

25X1A

[REDACTED] But the discrepancy is that we have hired a great many at a nine. The normal grade for a Ph.D. is a 9.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That, incidentally, is quite a morale factor, because we do exactly that, we hire on one side of the house at one level and on the other side at another level.

MR. WHITE: And there is a lot of talking going around: "Why do you fool around with that outfit over there? Come with us." That is why I believe we should have some method.

25X1A

[REDACTED] Aren't we close to Civil Service? I don't mean we ought to be Civil Service.

MR. WHITE: You mean as to time-in-grade?

25X1A

[REDACTED] Civil Service has abandoned that.

25X1A

[REDACTED] This has a good effect on the personnel in my office because now they know there is some system and they can't importune their supervisors to put in strong recommendations to get them considered out of order with somebody else. We have made exceptions. We took a Lieutenant Colonel in the Air Force, the Board took him on as a 9 when he should have been taken on as a 12. Well, we rectified that as soon as we could get him into a slot where he belonged.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me ask one question of the Board as a whole: How many of the Board members think there ought to be a schedule such as this for bringing people into the zone of consideration for promotions?

25X1A

[REDACTED] I think so.

25X1A

[REDACTED] I think so.

(Complete count of show of hands not made by Reporter)

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How many think there shouldn't be?

MR. AMORY: What was the question?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: My question is, do you think there should be a cross-Agency schedule such as this, by which all individuals will know that if they are in grades 2, 3 or 4, they do not come into the zone of consideration for promotion unless they have served six months.

MR. AMORY: Yes, I am in favor of a schedule.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And it would be understood such is a schedule solely for bringing people into consideration for promotion. It does not mean

SECRET

they will be promoted at the end of that time; in fact, they may remain in a grade for the rest of their life.

MR. AMORY: The other side of that coin would be that if they occupied a position with a slot higher than that, the normal presumption would be that having served out this thing they should be promoted, because if not they are misassigned. If you have a guy as a 12 in a 14 slot--and assume a schedule was adopted for say 24 months--then in the normal situation you would promote or boot him.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: As a supervisor you are waving a two-headed axe over your head, because if the man isn't qualified he should be down-graded.

25X1A [REDACTED] But you have the situation where the grade was arrived at because of the person who held the job, but maybe his successor was not quite the same kind of a person and maybe he did not do the same kind of a job. There would be chaos if you down-graded every time that occurred. There are many cases throughout the Agency, however, where people are in slots a couple of grades higher, and, properly, they are not promoted to those grades.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But the individual should be told that: (a) he is in the slot temporarily; and (b) when somebody comes along better qualified, he has had it.

25X1A [REDACTED] There is another factor, Kirk, in your proposition, and that is that 2, 3 and 4's will be assured of consideration; in other words, consideration is mandatory within a certain period of time. They just don't get overlooked.

25X1A [REDACTED] That is applicable all the way through. This brings him up for consideration at least by that time, if not sooner.

25X1A [REDACTED] That really puts you into a type of promotion system which can be handled on a flexible basis by your board. Isn't that about the size of it?

25X1A [REDACTED] This is by all odds the most sensible paper on promotion I have ever seen in this outfit.

25X1A [REDACTED] It is expanding rapidly. It has expanded over 300 per cent since Korea. We knew what the jobs were but we couldn't push them up. But now we are getting to the point where the ceiling has frozen and people have been with us long enough now to give us a good idea of what their potential is. There is no uniformity--with all due regard to Wage and

SECRET

Classification--in the relative values of slots. You don't know how they can compare. It's an extremely difficult thing, and I think semantics has a lot to do with it. If you call it a "diesel mechanic" that's a 7 or maybe a 9, but maybe it turns out he's chief of a power plant of KPT generators and then he's an "engineer" and not a "diesel mechanic". I don't know that it can ever be done - that it can be leveled out.

25X1A [REDACTED] Wasn't there another factor which preceded this? Namely, your norm system, which was sort of an intermediary step to take the major inequities out of your grade structure? Is it worth discussing that?

25X1A [REDACTED] We are going back to something like that. We set up certain factors of norm such as age, formal education above high school, length of time with CIA or predecessor organizations, and then those are all added up, which came to a norm for that grade. Say in grade 9 the norm was 27.5. Then we began comparing people to try to level them off. That worked well until we got them leveled off.

25X1A [REDACTED] And then you abandoned it?

25X1A [REDACTED] Not completely. We are going to have to go back again to something like that for selection of the best qualified. Well, not really for the best qualified. I think the Air Force had considered them for promotion if they were qualified, and everybody was qualified, practically. So then they had to go to best qualified and that causes people, presumably the leaders, to step up and get promoted over the people who are qualified but not "best qualified". I am going to have to go back into something like a norm system.

25X1A [REDACTED] That isn't binding. It's only a means of highlighting or pointing out a man for more serious consideration.

25X1A [REDACTED] It flagged him for consideration. If the norm for his grade, let's say a 7, was 21 something, and you added or calculated the norms for all the GS-7's and you found one man who had a norm of 35 or 40, you examined him to find out: Was he a forgotten man? Well, that process has been completed now. We have corrected many of the inequities due to a flexible standard or no standard of hiring.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, it seems to me we are in agreement that there should be a cross-Agency time-in-grade criteria for selection to promotion. We are also in agreement that in issuing any such statement it should be very carefully phrased so that it is made known that this does not necessarily mean

SECRET

promotion will take place. But it DOES mean the individual will be considered at those particular times and grades.

We also seem to be in agreement that this should be supplemented and simultaneously implemented with a standardized criteria for hiring into the grade, particularly as far as degrees are concerned, across the Agency, so that we don't get disparate results in different parts of the Agency.

25X1A

Do we have to tie those both together, Kirk?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think it is so difficult. You are going to get your specialized jobs, of course, but I do think we are going to have an increasing problem if a Ph.D. comes into the DD/P area as a 9 and suddenly realizes that he could have come into the DD/I area as an 11 or 12, - if one side of the house hires on the basis of the more degrees you have the more money you can get, and the other side doesn't care whether you have a degree or not beyond the basic one.

25X1A

Putting too much criteria on an academic degree is dangerous. There are a lot of people who work summers to get a degree just because that means they get a grade raise, but that doesn't mean they are scholars at all.

25X1A

That should be one of the factors, but only one. Age and a good many other things go into that.

25X1A

You recognize there are still inequities in hiring, but by not having a minimum time-in-grade and having, rather, a normal time-in-grade, you are then enabled to promote faster the people who have been hired at too low a level or who have spent too long a time at some lower grade. And that has also happened. But if you do establish a normal time-in-grade at which your case is subject to mandatory consideration, then I think half our problems are over. People know where they stand, or at least know during that period and for such time afterwards, and we are not bothered by the constant stream of demands for promotion, which, when we satisfy them as we have been satisfying them, come so fast that practically everybody in the Agency is going to be in grade 15 or 20 years, the last two-thirds of his career. It's that very pressure that has brought about too rapid promotion in the outfit.

25X1A

And it's always corrected by moving upward rather than downward. I don't know of anybody who ever went downward.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Oh, yes. They have either been down-graded or

SECRET

out-graded, and there is a surprising number of those.

MR. AMORY: Well, to get on with the business, Kirk, the motion will be in order that the OO Notice, the last sheet or two there, as the qualifications? With the appropriate words changed? As I take it, Joe, where it says "the following time-in-grade prerequisites" will mean you will serve 21 months in a 13? I don't think the language is particularly happily chosen.

25X1A [REDACTED] To serve in grade as a GS-13 21 months before you are considered for promotion to a 14.

MR. AMORY: I feel very strongly that something in the order of two years should be the highest figure that we put down, to preserve this flexibility that I talked about. It may well be just because there wouldn't be enough 15's open that the average time for serving in a mature office like yours or in ORR would be six to ten years. The fact is, if you have a vacancy and a darn good guy, I think that is long enough to demonstrate it. If he is very young, that is another reason for holding him back. But I don't think the 48 months in

25X1A [REDACTED] would be palatable, to my mind, in my side of the shop.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What I think you ought to do, Bob--I know you are in the middle of a motion, but if I can join the motion I think we should ask Personnel to draft a time-in-grade statement along the lines that we have discussed today.

25X1A [REDACTED] Because the gimmick in this is as you go from office to office you find out the number of people to be considered in different grades vary so dramatically from office to office that unless you try to find some norm, which won't be realistic for [REDACTED] but which will be for us, and vice versa, we can't have a general Agency problem. I venture to say, 25X1A [REDACTED] that if you ran statistics on your employees, probably the number of total personnel that you have between the grades of 7 and 11, is probably damn near 89 or 90 per cent of all of your people.

25X1A [REDACTED] It probably is. We have done that, and what I have been trying to do is to get a pretty flat bottom pyramid, sort of shaped like this (indicating) as you come up. With the exception of grade 11 it pretty nearly conforms to that shape.

25X1A [REDACTED] Whereas in Amory's shop you have a large concentration in 13, 14 and 15. It's probably an inverted pyramid.

MR. AMORY: ONE is virtually that.

SECRET

SECRET

25X1A [REDACTED] So we have to find some kind of a norm that we can all use.

25X1A [REDACTED] These statistics are available for each office, but, as you remember, at the last meeting we decided we were not going to distribute those figures. They are available to the head of each office, to see what his pyramid is.

25X1A [REDACTED] This ought to be turned over to the Personnel Office to try to find that norm which seems most applicable in terms of every office.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then in view of Red's statement, in which I concur, that discussions now going on in the so-called Super-Grade Board in re competitive promotion, etc., it would probably be foolish on our part to try to join issue with that battle at the moment. And if we can handle this time-in-grade as being one aspect of promotion policy which should be standardized, that would be at least one blow for freedom.

25X1A [REDACTED] We would be delighted to do it. It is one of the most difficult problems we have to face.

MR. WHITE: If you establish this norm, we all recognize there are going to be exceptions on both sides. We ought to have something that has enough teeth in it. An awful lot of personnel actions all the way up to include grade 15 are signed by the administrative officers of a Division, etc. We ought to make sure that the exceptions receive consideration at a certain level. I don't know whether that is the Assistant Director.

25X1A [REDACTED] It certainly is. If you don't do that you haven't got a system.

MR. WHITE: And write such a thing so that the exception doesn't become the rule.

MR. AMORY: I think your phraseology is good on the guide. I pass on all 11's myself, but it gets routine.

25X1A [REDACTED] But we're agreed that we do want something on the order of this paragraph 2.d. of the 00 paper?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We are.

Any new business to come up? SECRET